

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 13 has been amended. Claims 13-22, and 25 are pending and under consideration.

As a preliminary matter, it is noted that an interview was conducted between the Examiner and the Applicant's representative on May 1, 2007. The Examiner is again thanked for her time. During the interview, the Examiner appeared to agree that the relationship between the first and second slopes mainly receiving light from the first and second light sources was shown in the drawings. However, the Examiner requested claim amendments to further clarify these features. Based on our discussions, claim 13 and the Specification are amended as attached, in order to overcome the drawing objections and Specification objections.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully traversed. Independent claim 13 recites a prismatic light control member provided with a great number of pairs of first and second slopes disposed along said second emission face so that said first slopes mainly receive light from said first primary light source and said second slopes mainly receive light from said second primary light source to control directivity of output illumination light from said second emission face. It is noted that the slopes of the prism array 321 of Miyashita receive light *after* light receiving is performed by the top and side surfaces 312a,b of the projections 312. In contrast, in present Fig. 2, the light is received directly from the lamps 11 by the prism sheet 9.

As shown, for example, in present Fig. 1, prism sheet 9 controls directivity of output illumination light from second emission face 7BO of light guide plate 7B. Light received from first primary light source 11A is mainly received by first slopes and light received from second primary light source 11B is mainly received by second slopes.

Okuda does not teach the claimed dividing up of received light. Furthermore, Miyashita teaches element 321 having first and second slopes, however, there is no light emitted from the light guide plate, as shown in Fig. 25 of the reference. Neither of the slopes receive light 306. Instead, slopes on the right side are only used for inner reflection after light receiving is completed by the upper flat face opposite both slopes.

The remaining references do not overcome these deficiencies, and are not relied upon by the Examiner to do so. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is


requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8-1-07

By:   
Michael J. Badagliacca  
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501